

REMARKS

Claims 1-13 were presented for examination and were rejected. Claims 2, 6, and 12 have been canceled and independent claims 1 and 9 have been amended to incorporate subject matter previously recited in claim 2.

The applicants request reconsideration in light of the amendments to the claims and the following comments.

35 U.S.C. 112 Rejection of Claims 1-13

Claims 1-13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to provide proper antecedent basis for "providing a result of said evaluation." In particular, the Office pointed that claims 1 and 9 recited two evaluation steps.

The applicants respectfully submit that the claims have been amended to recite only one evaluation step, and therefore, the rejection of the claims is overcome.

35 U.S.C. 112 Rejection of Claims 2-5

Claims 1 and 9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to provide proper antecedent basis for "said determining step."

Claim 2 has been canceled.

Claims 3-5 have been amended to overcome the rejection. .

35 U.S.C. 102 Rejection of Claims 1, 7, 9, and 13

Claims 1, 7, 9, and 13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 (e) as being anticipated by A. Aura, U.S. Publication 2003/0166397 (hereinafter "Aura"). The applicants respectfully traverse.

Claim 1, as amended, recites:

1. A method comprising:
determining if a device was previously connected to an untrusted network; and
evaluating the integrity of some of the data on the device ***when the device was previously connected to the untrusted network.***
(emphasis added)

Nowhere does Aura teach or suggest, alone or in combination, what claim 1 recites — namely, ***evaluating the integrity*** of some of the data on a device ***when the device was previously connected to an untrusted network.***

In particular, Aura fails to teach: (i) connecting to an untrusted network, or (2) evaluating the integrity of some of the data of the device after the device connects to an untrusted network.

For the foregoing reasons, the applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of claim 1 is overcome.

Because claim 7 depends on claim 1, the applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of claim 7 is also overcome.

Claim 9, as amended, recites:

9. An apparatus comprising:
a memory; and
a processor, coupled to the memory, for:
determining if a device was previously connected to an untrusted network; and
evaluating the integrity of some of the data on the device when the device was previously connected to the untrusted network.
(emphasis supplied)

For the same reasons as for claim 1 the applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of claim 9 is traversed.

Because claim 13 depends on claim 9, the applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of claim 13 is traversed.

35 U.S.C. 103 Rejection of Claims 2, 3, 6, and 12

Claims 2, 3, 6, and 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over A. Aura, U.S. Publication 2003/0166397 (hereinafter "Aura") in view of B. Jemes, U.S. Publication 2001/0042213 (hereinafter "Jemes").

Claims 2 and 12 have been canceled.

Because claims 3 and 6 depend on claim 1, and because Jemes fails to cure the deficiencies of Aura, the applicants submit that the rejection of them is overcome.

Because claim 12 depends on claim 9, and because Jemes fails to cure the deficiencies of Aura, the applicants submit that the rejection of claim 12 is traversed.

35 U.S.C. 103 Rejection of Claims 4 and 10

Claims 4 and 10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over A. Aura, U.S. Publication 2003/0166397 (hereinafter "Aura") in view of T. Noguchi, U.S. Publication 2003/0005333 (hereinafter "Noguchi").

Because claim 4 depends on claim 1, and because Noguchi fails to cure the deficiencies of Aura, the applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of claim 4 is overcome.

Because claim 10 depends on claim 9, and because Noguchi fails to cure the deficiencies of Aura, the applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of claim 10 is traversed.

35 U.S.C. 103 Rejection of Claims 5 and 11

Claims 5 and 11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over A. Aura, U.S. Publication 2003/0166397 (hereinafter "Aura") in view of P. Manchin, U.S. Publication 2004/0049567 (hereinafter "Manchin").

Because claim 5 depends on claim 1, and because Manchin fails to cure the deficiencies of Aura, the applicants respectfully submit that the rejection claim 5 is overcome.

Because claim 11 depends on claim 9, and because Manchin fails to cure the deficiencies of Aura, the applicants respectfully submit that the rejection claim 11 is traversed.

35 U.S.C. 103 Rejection of Claim 8

Claim 8 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over A. Aura, U.S. Publication 2003/0166397 (hereinafter "Aura") in view of K. Hoene, U.S. Publication 2002/0199116 (hereinafter "Hoene").

Because claim 8 depends on claim 1, and because Hoene fails to cure the deficiencies of Aura, the applicants respectfully submit that the rejection claim 8 is overcome.

Request for Reconsideration Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. 1.111

Having responded to each and every ground for objection and rejection in the last Office action, applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the instant application pursuant to 37 CFR 1.111 and request that the Examiner allow all of the pending claims and pass the application to issue.

If there are remaining issues, the applicants respectfully request that Examiner telephone the applicants' attorney so that those issues can be resolved as quickly as possible.

Respectfully,
Martin Kappes et al.

By **/Kiril Dimov/**
Kiril Dimov
Reg. No. 60490
732-578-0103 x215

DeMont & Breyer, L.L.C.
Suite 250
100 Commons Way
Holmdel, NJ 07733
United States of America